UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,992	01/25/2002	Laurent Frerebeau	T3264-907643	8715

181   7590   11/01/2006

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3"></td><td>Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2" style="vertical-align:top">10/031,992</td><td rowspan="2" style="vertical-align:top">FREREBEAU ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr></tr>
</table>

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/031,992	FREREBEAU ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Nathan Hillery	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 October 2006</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>14-17,19 and 21-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>14-17,19 and 21-33</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 10/18/06.

2.   Claims 14 – 17, 19 and 21 – 33 are pending in the case. Claims 14, 23, 24, 27,

and 28 are independent.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

10/18/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 14 – 17, 19, 21 – 25 and 27 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Christy et al. (US 20020002452 A1).

6.   **Regarding independent claim 14,** Christy et al. teach that text is represented at

two levels: first in a language-specific, highly constrained grammar, and second in a

language-neutral pivot language. Each level is desirably formatted in XML, using "tags"

to characterize elements such as statements and field data. A tag surrounds the

relevant element(s), beginning with a string of the form <tagname> and ending with

</tagname>. For example, XML-represented content may include grammatical

structures, identifiers for different meanings of the same word or word-concept, and

other attributes (e.g., a set of expansion rules or allowed sentence structures) useful in

performing translation (paragraph block 0058), which meet the limitation of **detecting a**

localization tag in the document, the localization tag controlling one or more of

structure, appearance and dynamic behavior of the markup document; retrieving,

from the document, localization information being associated with said

localization tag, the localization information associated with a language.

Christy et al. teach that module 125 processes single linguistic units or structural

components of each inputted sentence in an iterative fashion, addressing the databases

130 to locate the corresponding entries in the given language, as well as the

corresponding entries in the target language (paragraph block 0045), which meet the

limitation of **searching in a language translation file for a previously determined**

localized value associated with the localization information.

Christy et al. teach that analysis module 125 translates the sentence by replacing

the input entries with the entries from the target language, entering the translation into

an output buffer 145. This process allows the remote user to create a Web page in

which content is expressed in the pivot language, enabling the page to be provided in a

requested language (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **replacing**

said localization tag in the document with the localized value found in the

language translation file.

7.   **Regarding dependent claims 15 – 17 and 19**, Christy et al. teach that text is

represented at two levels: first in a language-specific, highly constrained grammar, and

second in a language-neutral pivot language. Each level is desirably formatted in XML,

using "tags" to characterize elements such as statements and field data. A tag

surrounds the relevant element(s), beginning with a string of the form <tagname> and

ending with </tagname>. For example, XML-represented content may include

grammatical structures, identifiers for different meanings of the same word or word-

concept, and other attributes (e.g., a set of expansion rules or allowed sentence

structures) useful in performing translation (paragraph block 0058), which meet the

limitation of **said localization information includes at least one of a localization**

attribute, a default localization value, and a value corresponding to an automatic

transcription function; identifying a type of the document; detecting said

localization tag based on the type of document identified in said identifying step;

and recognizing at least one of grammar and syntax used in the document based

on the type of document identified in said identifying step; said tag is a markup

language tag.

8.   **Regarding dependent claim 21**, Christy et al. teach that text is represented at

two levels: first in a language-specific, highly constrained grammar, and second in a

language-neutral pivot language. Each level is desirably formatted in XML, using "tags"

to characterize elements such as statements and field data. A tag surrounds the

relevant element(s), beginning with a string of the form <tagname> and ending with

</tagname>. For example, XML-represented content may include grammatical

structures, identifiers for different meanings of the same word or word-concept, and

other attributes (e.g., a set of expansion rules or allowed sentence structures) useful in

performing translation (paragraph block 0058), which meet the limitation of **creating the**

language translation file to include information which associates said localization

information with said localized value.

9.   **Regarding dependent claim 22**, Christy et al. teach that module 125 processes

single linguistic units or structural components of each inputted sentence in an iterative

fashion, addressing the databases 130 to locate the corresponding entries in the given

language, as well as the corresponding entries in the target language. Analysis module

125 translates the sentence by replacing the input entries with the entries from the

target language, entering the translation into an output buffer 145. This process allows

the remote user to create a Web page in which content is expressed in the pivot

language, enabling the page to be provided in a requested language (paragraph block

0045), which meet the limitation of **loading code used to implement said localization**

tool into the document, said code dynamically generating additional code; and

performing said replacing step as said additional code is dynamically generated by said code used to implement said localization tool.

10.   **Regarding dependent claims 29 – 33**, Christy et al. teach that Maintaining the entire document in the pivot language facilitates not only accurate searching but also ready translation into different languages (paragraph block 0055), which meet the limitation of **said language translation file is maintained using a pivot language.**

11.   **Regarding independent claims 23, 24, 27, and 28**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 14, and are rejected along the same rationale.

12.   **Regarding dependent claim 25**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christy

et al. (US 20020002452 A1) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Jeske

(US005974443A) [as cited by Applicant].

15.   **Regarding dependent claim 26**, Christy et al. does not explicitly teach **the**

localization tool is a CGI component.

         However, Jeske teaches that *the preferred embodiment is to use CGI 111, which*

is an industry standard method of communicating between a web server and another

program. HTTPd 103 initiates the CGIG process (common gateway interface gateway)

104, which is a program component that provides access to the agent platform 105.

Note that more than one CGIG 104 can be running on the web server 102, with one

CGIG per concurrent browser request (Column 3, lines 15 – 22), which meet the

limitation of **the localization tool is a CGI component**.

         It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the invention of Christy et al. with that of Jeske because such a

combination would allow the users of Christy et al. the benefit of an *access tool that*

allows for dynamic information generation for web servers (Column 2, lines 54 – 55).

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14 – 17, 19, and 21 – 33 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

NH